DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 851 FL 800 690

TITLE	Chicago Quality Programs Project Report #1.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, Rantoul.
SPONS AGENCY	Lloyd A. Fry Foundation, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE	Nov 92
NOTE	90p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Literacy; *Data Collection; English (Second Language); *Evaluation Methods; *Literacy Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Records (Forms); Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

An outgrowth of several previous projects conducted by the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center (ILRDC), the Quality Programs Project is a collaborative effort to improve the quality of literacy services in the Chicago area. A long-term investment in quality programming at the local level, the Quality Programs Project has as its primary goals the training and professional development of literacy program staff and the formation of site-specific evaluation systems. Staff from six sites participated in three sequential training sessions. The sites were the Onward Neighborhood House, Youth Service Project, Chicago Consortium for Worker Education, Midwest Women's Center, The Neighborhood Institute, and Firman Community Services. The sessions introduced site staff to the evaluation system adapted by the ILRDC, presented information on qualitative and quantitative data collection methodologies, and introduced strategies for comprehensive data analysis. The ILRDC staff provided on-going support to site staff as they developed and refined their goals. Each site used the ILRDC evaluation framework to create assessment systems and tools that were customized for their programs and their own goals. This report summarizes the development and progress of the first phase of the project. Appendices making up the greater part of the report contain several questionnaires and evaluation instruments. (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education) (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359851

Chicago Quality Programs Project
Report #1

©Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center

FL 800 690

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Suzanne Knell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chicago Quality Programs Project Report #1

©Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, November 1992

FL 800 690

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations within this report are the authors'. They do not necessarily represent the opinions or positions of the Lloyd A. Fry Foundation.

INTRODUCTION

The Quality Programs Project is a collaborative effort to improve the quality of literacy services in the Chicago area. By conducting this project, the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center has assisted six Chicago literacy programs to develop and implement evaluation systems that are program specific. These customized evaluation/assessment systems will guide program design and development for each individual program.

BACKGROUND

The Quality Programs Project (QPP) is an outgrowth of several previous projects conducted by the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center (ILRDC). These projects are reviewed briefly to establish the context from which this unique and innovative project grew.

In 1988, the ILRDC with support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, began an investigation of family literacy programs in Illinois. The exploratory study consisted of an intensive twelve-month review of 19 family literacy sites. The ILRDC field research, coupled with a theoretical and academic review of the field, resulted in *The Mechanics of Success for Families, Family Literacy Report #1*. The report summarizes the background materials, describes each of the sites visited, and provides examples of recruitment techniques, curriculum materials, and evaluation strategies used by the programs.

An important aspect of this project was to develop evaluation recommendations for local providers. The relative newness of the field created a desire to prove that programs were indeed working and to somehow capture the richness of just how that was happening. In response, the ILRDC expanded on the work of researchers in the family support field (Weiss and Jacobs, 1988) to design an evaluation framework which would be both useful for evaluation and program development. The framework and the recommendations for its use are outlined in *The Mechanics of Success for Families, Family Literacy Report #2, Evaluation*.

The following year, the ILRDC assisted six of the sites originally surveyed in 1988 for Report #1 to put the evaluation framework in place. This experimental training revealed the usefulness of the framework and the necessity of employing a collaborative approach throughout the process. The process and findings are described in *Fine Tuning the Mechanics of Success for Families, Report #3, Evaluation and Program Development*.

In 1991, the ILRDC initiated the Quality Programs Project. This project is a long-term investment in quality programming at the local level and a natural follow-up to work previously conducted. It has as its primary goals the training and professional development of literacy program staff and the formation of site-specific evaluation systems which inform program growth.

Staff from six Chicago sites were chosen to participate in three sequential training sessions. The sessions introduced site staff to the evaluation system adapted by the ILRDC, presented information on qualitative and quantitative data collection methodologies, and introduced strategies for comprehensive data analysis. Throughout the project period, the ILRDC staff provided on-going support to site staff as they developed, refined, and carried out their evaluation goals. This collaborative method has resulted in several significant program improvements at the local sites. This report summarizes the development and progress of the first phase of the project.

WHY THE PROJECT

There are over 1 million adults in the Chicagoland area who are in need of basic skills remediation. Estimates are that less than 1 percent (1%) of those in need are receiving services and the quality of those services is widely divergent. The variation in quality of adult education/literacy programs can be traced to several factors, not the least of which is a lack of on-going, comprehensive technical assistance for providers. Of particular significance is the fact that local programs rarely have the funds, staff, nor the expertise
to initiate or maintain a practical, useful evaluation system. Thus, providers are unclear on the impact of their programs and are unable to determine how they can improve services to their students.

Previous to the implementation of this project, most providers received their training from hit-and-miss workshops, informal discussions with colleagues, and by searching out individual academic opportunities. According to the providers, this system had fallen short of meeting their needs and, in effect, had undermined efforts to help students reach their education goals.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

To address the issue of providing quality programs for students, the ILRDC provided in-depth, sequential training in an evaluation system developed by the ILRDC and based on work by Heather Weiss and Francine Jacobs. This assessment/evaluation system is developmental in nature, providing both information on program success and suggesting needed improvements. Another important aspect of the framework is that it accommodates the varying designs of adult education/literacy programs. In fact, the site staff participating in the project were encouraged to incorporate the goals of their specific programs as well as those of their students into the evaluation process.

The framework places program components in relation to five levels of evaluation (Table 1). Program components, or elements of service, are specific to the type of program offered. As an example, five components have been identified for the family literacy programs. Regardless of program components, the five levels of evaluation (Jacobs '88) are: needs assessment, program documentation, formative evaluation, program progress and program impact (Table 2).

A distinct advantage with this approach is that it allows a program to engage in different levels of evaluation within different program components. The framework also serves as a developmental tool, suggesting evaluation strategies for implementing new components. For instance, a program may be at the formative evaluation level (level 3) for one component and looking to the future, may implement level one, needs assessment, as a first step in the development of another program component. Using this framework as a guide, project participants were able to customize their own evaluation based on the components of their program, their stage of development and their own needs. Once in place, each provider's evaluation system generated a continuous flow information for monitoring and modifying program design.

At each level of the evaluation process, specific steps are suggested. Those steps include identifying:

1. purpose of evaluation
2. evaluation questions
3. audiences
4. strategies/tasks
5. types of data to collect
6. interpretation and dissemination of findings
7. incorporation of findings into program planning

Table 1
Evaluation Framework

Significant Program Components	*(List of appropriate components)*
Level 1 Needs Assessment (Preimplementation)	
Level 2 Accountability (Program Documentation)	
Level 3 Formative Evaluation (Program Clarification)	
Level 4 Program Progress (Progress towards Objectives)	
Level 5 Program Impact	

(Adapted from Weiss, 1988; Jacobs, 1988)

Each of these steps was addressed as part of the development of each site's evaluation plan. Incorporating these steps into their evaluation plans furthered the site-specificity for each provider as well as offering direction for implementation of their plans.

SITE SELECTION

The project was received with overwhelming enthusiasm. An application was sent to all known literacy providers in Chicago (Appendix 1). Nineteen applicants responded and competed for five slots. Almost every proposal specified goals in several areas of evaluation/assessment. So great was the indicated need and so well thought out were the proposals, that the project team chose to serve six rather that five sites.

The final six sites were selected based on the following criteria: 1) program type: an effort was made to select representative programs focusing on family literacy, workforce education, or general adult education/literacy representing various neighborhoods/areas of the city; 2) demonstrated interest: programs committed to improving services to students were given priority; 3) soundness of proposed assessment/evaluation idea; and 4) ability to complete the project. All applications were reviewed by the project team.

PROCEDURES

The overall goal of the ILRDC Quality Programs Project was to improve the quality of services to students at six model family literacy sites. Specifically, the project had the following objectives:

Table 2

Level One	Pre-Implementation Tier Commonly known as a needs assessment, this phase is designed to answer the question "What is the problem?" The purpose of conducting a needs assessment is to determine that there is, indeed, a need for specific services and what those services might be. Generally, results of the needs assessment are disseminated to funding agencies, community members, and the potential participants. Evidence of the problem is documented through local demographics,a review of local press coverage, interviews with key community leaders, or a survey of the community.
Level Two	Accountability Tier This level has traditionally been known as program utilization. At this stage, the answer to "Who are we serving and what services are we providing?" is addressed. The audience is funding agencies, program providers, and participants. Data is collected on participant characteristics and service use. Theoretically, all programs should be conducting the accountability tier of the evaluation process. This type of data provides evidence about whether or not the targeted participants are being served, can provide guidance for changes within the program to the provider, and can be used to maintain current levels of funding or secure additional funds for program expansion.
Level Three	Program Clarification Tier This stage is more commonly recognized as formative or process evaluation. Data are collected from the staff and participants. The guiding question during this phase is: "How can we do a better job serving our participants?" (Jacobs, 1988; p. 57). The audience is funders, staff members, and program participants. The level of satisfaction of the program participants as well as their assessment of how the program might better meet their needs should be the primary data collected during this phase.
Level Four	Progress-Toward-Objectives Tier At this stage, short-term program effectiveness objectives are specified and reviewed to see whether they have been achieved. The guiding question is: "Are the participants making progress?" The audience is funding agencies, program participants, community members, program providers, and perhaps an external review committee. Programs which have been operating for an extended period of time with substantial financial resources would implement this phase of the evaluation process.
Level Five	Program Impact Tier At this stage, the program is committed to an experimental or quasi-experimental approach to evaluate program effects and has the funding to carry out an extensive evaluation. The guiding question is: "What are the long-term effects of program participation?" Treatments are clearly specified with intensive data collection strategies involving multi-year efforts. Although this phase provides feedback to the program, there is usually an external report made. At this level, attempts are made to provide evidence of differential effectiveness and/or recommend program models for replication.

1. Increase the knowledge base of staff at six model sites in the area of program evaluation and its effect on program development.

2. Assist six local programs in the design and development of tools and instruments to assess the literacy skills and needs of their populations, to determine areas of program improvement, and to document learner and program progress.

3. Examine and synthesize the evaluation information generated by the sites to reveal commonalities and divergences.

4. Document and disseminate evaluation strategies, assessment/evaluation tools and instruments, and preliminary findings.

To achieve the first three goals, The Quality Programs Project implemented a two tier approach: instructional training sessions and regular consultations with site staff. Relevant staff members from all six sites attended three intensive, full day training sessions organized and facilitated by the Project Coordinator and the ILRDC Evaluation Specialist. Each of the trainings conducted were sequential in nature and built upon the work done by the programs over the course of the project period. These three sessions are described below:

In December, the Quality Programs Project staff conducted the initial training session attended by at least two staff members from all six sites. At this session, participants were introduced to the ILRDC evaluation/developmental framework. The ILRDC staff reviewed the goals of the project and outlined the practical aspects and applicability of the framework. The site staff discussed and refined their goals for the project.

The second training session was held in February and was devoted to development of evaluation/assessment tools and instruments. The ILRDC Evaluation Specialist spent a considerable amount of time discussing methods of qualitative and quantitative data collection. Individual site staff presented their plans to the group and, based on the presentation, indicated tools and instruments they were interested in developing, adopting or adapting. The entire group provided feedback.

The third and final training session occurred in May. This meeting focused on data analysis. The ILRDC Evaluation Specialist presented methods of qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Special emphasis was placed on use of the results; particularly in relation to program development. Site staff shared information on progress made and barriers confronted. Several sites commented on the preliminary results of their evaluations.

The collaborative nature of this project is extremely important to its acceptance by the providers and ultimately, its success. The uniqueness of this project lies in the design and implementation of this model. The role of the ILRDC project staff and evaluation specialist was always one of consultant offering technical assistance and support when needed to the providers. The control of the evaluation/assessment process remained in the hands of the providers. This "bottom up" approach makes the model created by the ILRDC far more accessible and site specific than the usual "top down" method of implementation. Individual consultations with site staff were an integral part of the process of this project. These consultations, whether held on-site or over the phone, were usually brainstorming sessions during which the QPP program coordinator and site staff talked their way through complex programmatic issues. What often resulted was a new approach to an old problem, with the program coordinator offering needed support and guidance through this new and, at times,

difficult learning process.

This final report will meet the last of the project goals. Information from the report will be disseminated throughout the ILRDC network.

PROGRAMS AND EVALUATION

The six programs selected to participate in the Quality Programs Project are different in many respects, such as location, population served, and overall goals. However, they experience many of the same problems and concerns while trying to deliver services to those participants who come to them for help. Each participating program and their evaluation work is briefly described below.

Site:	Onward Neighborhood House
Site Staff:	Deborah Both, Executive Director Ellen Murphy, Adult Education Coordinator
Level(s) of Evaluation:	Needs Assessment (Preimplementation)

Onward Neighborhood House is located in the West Town Community in Chicago and serves over 600 members of that community. Most of the agency's program participants are native speakers of Spanish, and receive services ranging from Head Start (home and/or center based) to counseling to a concentrated multi-level curriculum in English as a Second Language (ESL). Onward has an active community outreach strategy for recruiting: class content, times and date are scheduled at four-month intervals and distributed to other community organizations, community residents, and Onward staff members.

This community-based organization simultaneously functions as a Chicago City College site for adult education services, and a Head Start and day care service center. Onward serves approximately 110 children and some of their parents.

The Executive Director and the Adult Education Coordinator began to wonder if there was a need for family literacy services. Their Head Start program carries a requirement for parent meetings and workshops, and the children are often present when these events occur. This organization also provides after-school tutoring and social clubs for children over the age of five. With the perfect setting available for family literacy activities, providing such services seemed a natural thing to do. As a result of the programs already in place, Onward was actually serving or making services available to entire families in their community.

Thus, the guiding question for their project was threefold:

> Who are the parents and relatives of the children served in day-care and Head Start?
>
> What are the services not currently provided that parents need and are interested in?
>
> How can day-care and Head Start parents and relatives be encouraged to participate in the adult education program?

The Executive Director decided that the best course of action to take to answer these questions would

be to conduct a needs assessment. Both the Executive Director and the Adult Education Coordinator decided to utilize three strategies. First, they developed a written questionnaire to survey the parents and adult relatives of children enrolled in Head Start and day-care at Onward which also included those adults participating in adult education classes. The questions were designed to elicit information about parents' interests, children's interests, activities parents and children enjoy and do together, activities families don't engage in, and what parents think their children need (Appendix 2).

Since many of Onward's program participants are native Spanish speakers, it was important not to create language barriers that might discriminate against them. To ensure against such discrimination, a dual strategy was adopted. First, the parent/adult questionnaire was designed in English and Spanish. Additionally, to accommodate those adults who may have had lower reading/educational levels, the questionnaire was used as a guide for conducting an oral interview. Program staff were trained in interviewing techniques and asking questions exactly as they were written and recording responses exactly as they were received. The same instructions were given for Spanish and English to prevent the loss of meaning or intensity of responses, especially in translation from Spanish to English. Interviewers were also told to note any questions, problems, or comments that arose during the interviewing process. This combination of strategies guarded against the possibility of missed responses due to a lack of comprehension or language skills.

A second questionnaire was developed for Onward's program coordinators and teachers who have daily contact with the children in day-care and Head Start (Appendix 2). It contained questions that could be compared to the program participant responses gathered from the first questionnaire. It was also important for those staff members at Onward who were not directly involved in the QPP process to have a sense of ownership and responsibility in the project, by making them active participants in the process and incorporating their understanding and perception of family needs.

The questionnaire was piloted and revised for clarity and then distributed to program coordinators for administration to parents and adult relatives. Simultaneously, the staff questionnaire was completed by group workers, teachers, the Executive Director, and the Adult Education Coordinator. Within two weeks, all 117 questionnaires distributed were completed.

Findings

The results of Onward's survey indicated that there were three differences between the primary student populations (English and Spanish speaking) which would effect the design and implementation of a family literacy program: time of day adults were available to participate; formal education experience; and language. There were also commonalities to take into consideration: both populations had a strong interest in having a family literacy program on-site; attended specific Onward activities/workshops; and were interested in information which reflected the importance of being a parent.

The results of the survey indicated that there was an interest in family literacy services among all the families Onward served. The staff's major concerns in the development of the new programs were: meeting time, educational level of the adults, experience, language, and the different needs and preferences expressed by the Spanish and English-speaking populations. To address these concerns, the Executive Director and Adult Education Coordinator decided to offer two different program options at Onward.

The first family literacy program will be designed to serve the needs of the Spanish-speaking respondents without high school educations. The majority of parents in this group are unemployed and have more flexible schedules. To take advantage of their availability, Spanish family literacy

programs with ESL instruction at appropriate levels will be offered two morning per week as a component of Onward's Head Start program. The second family literacy program will be offered in English, two evenings per week, to correspond to the needs of the English-speaking parents, the majority of whom were found to be employed. Session length for both options will be 1½ to 2 hours each.

The interests revealed by the survey as most prevalent among parents will be incorporated into the subject matter of the ESL and adult education classes. Learning how to support their children's academic efforts and child development ranked high as interests among all parents. Workshops will be conducted to address the needs parents expressed for further information on these topics. Parent/child reading partnerships and adult/child play and art activities ranked high in the preferences of both populations of parents responding. These activities, along with trips to the library and doing homework together will form the basis of adult/child activities in the family literacy program.

Onward's Executive Director and Adult Education Coordinator plan to compile the results of their needs assessment into a narrative summary, which will be distributed to all who participated in the survey. The presentation of the results will say to the parents who participated, "This is what you have said is most important in helping your child to learn. This is what you said you want to learn. This is what you said your child is most interested in doing, and this is what an organized family activity program at Onward House can do to help you meet your personal and parental goals." Onward is in the process of redesigning portions of its early childhood and adult education components to correspond to the needs assessment results. Most notable among these changes, is that the daily time allotted for parent/child activities which will be increased. The resulting changes in Onward's program offerings are forging stronger links between their adult education and early childhood programs. The agency is positioning itself to be eligible for more funding, specifically for family literacy.

Additionally, workshops will be incorporated into their adult education component. The content of these workshops will come directly from the subjects parents thought would be most helpful to them in helping their children. Some of the children's activities will be those that parents said their children enjoyed most.

Family portfolios will be maintained to indicate participant progress in the family literacy program. The contents will be reviewed to assess families' goals and whether they are being achieved. These portfolios will contain goal setting forms, anecdotal records to keep track of observable behavioral changes in individuals and families, attendance records, library book borrowing record (including number of books and types, writing samples, and art work). ESL students will add written self-evaluations to their portfolios, along with regular progress reports.

Evaluation Summary

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions:

- To determine the interest in a family literacy program among families already served at Onward

  - Who (demographically) are the parents and relatives of the children served in Onward's day-care and Head Start?

  - What are the services not currently provided that these parents/adults need and are interested in?

♦ How can day-care and Head Start parents and relatives be encouraged to participate in the adult education program?

Audiences

Program staff
Program planners
Students
Potential funders

Strategies/tasks

- Survey both English and Spanish Speaking parents/relatives of children in day-care and Head Start
- Survey Onward staff

Data collected/Analysis

- Two distinct "populations" of families revealed by demographic analysis

- Both populations interested in similar family literacy services including: helping children in school, understanding child development

Program Planning

- Two programs will be offered with similar curricula but at different times

---

For more information on Onward's needs assessment or for a copy of their report, contact Debbie Both, Executive Director; Onward Neighborhood House; 600 North Leavitt St.; Chicago, IL 60612.

Site: Youth Service Project

Site Staff: Susan Pinner, Literacy Coordinator

Level(s) of Evaluation: Needs Assessment (Preimplementation)

Located on Chicago's Northwest side in Humboldt Park, Youth Service Project (YSP) is a community-based organization seeking to provide positive alternatives to social problems that affect young people in Chicago's inner-city communities. This agency, through nine different programs, provides opportunities for youth in the Humboldt Park area to discover their talents and interests and to make positive contributions to the community in which they live. Six of the programs offer individual and group counseling services, the other three provide educational and employment services in the form of tutoring, GED and ESL classes, job training and placement, and mentoring. Additionally, there is a program that promotes community awareness and advocacy. Many of the youth who participate in programs at YSP have experienced some sort of academic, social, and/or

behavioral problem. They have dropped out or been "pushed out" of the public school system and as a result, they are considered at risk of becoming involved in drugs, criminal violence, or teen pregnancy. To meet the needs of these young people, YSP is challenged to shape a curriculum that directly addresses the needs of this population.

Two of the programs currently offered by this agency target teen mothers. The Literacy Coordinator thought it would be helpful to link the programs for teenage mothers with their on-site literacy program by providing family literacy services. It was decided that the teenage mothers' program, Teens Adapting to Parenting (TAP), would be the most likely place to begin assessing the need for such a program.

The questions the Literacy Coordinator sought to answer were:

> Are TAP participants interested in family literacy services?
>
> Is there a need for such services?
>
> Is it possible to create a link between the TAP and literacy programs to provide such services?

The Literacy Coordinator interviewed the supervisor of the TAP program to become more familiar with the program how it worked. With this data, the Literacy Coordinator felt she would be able to determine whether or not a family literacy component would complement the current TAP activities. In addition, the Literacy Coordinator also observed three TAP support groups to determine what kinds of questions should be included in a survey of TAP participants. During the course of the project, several staffing changes occurred at the agency which affected the amount of time the Literacy Coordinator could realistically devote to the Quality Programs Project. The original goals were assessed, and it was decided that the development of a practical assessment instrument and its administration would be the best use of available time.

Two separate questionnaires were developed, one for program staff which included peer group facilitators, and the other for TAP participants (appendix 3). The questionnaires were designed to elicit the same kind of information from both groups to compare their perceptions of the need for a family literacy program at Youth Service Project.

The questionnaire for TAP participants originally had 21 questions, including information on employment, marital status, intergenerational learning patterns, child rearing patterns, educational goals, parenting concerns, and program participation. The staff questionnaire had 18, and many of the questions were similar, but their responses were based upon their perceptions of the teens in the program. The questionnaires were piloted; a total of 7 questionnaires were returned of the 11 distributed (the Literacy Coordinator attributes the difficulty in receiving the 4 missing questionnaires to not conducting a group administration).

Findings

Of the 11 questionnaires returned, 5 were from TAP participants and 2 from YSP staff. The results were compared and some preliminary conclusions were reached by the Literacy Coordinator. Those finding were: all of the respondents showed an interest in family literacy and being with other mothers for support was the reason for attending the program's group meetings.

The questionnaires are currently being revised and the Literacy Coordinator plans to administer the

survey to remaining TAP staff and to all participants. Guiding questions 2 and 3 have yet to be answered and additional educationally-related information needs to be gathered to determine the actual need for family literacy, based on the mothers' educational levels.

Evaluation Summary

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions

- To determine if TAP participants are interested in family literacy services
  - ♦ Are TAP participants interested in family literacy services?
  - ♦ Is there a need for such services?
  - ♦ It is possible to create a link between the TAP and literacy programs to provide such services?

Audiences

YSP staff
YSP administration
TAP participants

Strategies/tasks

- Survey TAP participants
- Survey TAP staff

Data collected/analysis

- Interest was evident among a small group of respondents

Program planning

- Re-administer questionnaire to supplement data

For more information or for a copy of the report, please contact Youth Service Project; 3942 West North Avenue; Chicago, IL 60647.

Site: Chicago Consortium for Worker Education

Site Staff: Paula Garcia, Literacy Coordinator

Level(s) of Evaluation: Accountability (Program Documentation)

The Chicago Consortium for Worker Education (CCWE) is a partnership between labor, business,

and the community, working together to increase Chicago's economic base. Working with companies, unions, and community-based organizations, the Consortium assesses educational needs, develops curricula plans and materials, forms linkages with local educational agencies, and involves students/workers in class planning. The Consortium organizes classes, develops classroom materials, trains teachers and tutors, and acts as an advocate in the development of workplace education policies. Classes organized by the Consortium provide basic skills training, GED preparation, training for new technology, and English as a Second Language classes for more than 300 students at eight sites.

With such a multifaceted program being run at so many sites, the Consortium found that their program had outgrown their record keeping and program evaluation methods. Their initial goals for this project were: 1) developing student-centered assessment and goal setting techniques; 2) improving student retention and learner progress; 3) developing a comprehensive evaluation process that would work for all of their programs.

CCWE's coordinator decided to first focus on documenting enrollment at all of their sites to improve the reliability of the evaluation and assessment of the total program. The classes at some of their program sites are taught by Chicago City College instructors who use only City College enrollment forms. These forms must be submitted to the City College Admissions Office and quite often CCWE is left without any student records for these classes. In contrast, classes coordinated by the Consortium and taught by non-City College instructors use student data sheets developed by CCWE and administer regular assessments, which are kept on file at CCWE.

The guiding questions for the Consortium were:

Who are we serving?
What services are we providing?

To find the answers, the Literacy Coordinator developed several forms designed to keep track of participants' enrollment and progress.

In designing the first of these forms, the Literacy Coordinator considered the type of information most often needed about students enrolled in Consortium classes. Since funders often require demographic information, race, gender, and age were included as questions to be answered. The Student Data Sheets (SDS) are designed to provide basic identifying information on students enrolled in classes. In addition, the SDS also identifies students' goals and/or reasons for enrolling in class while providing an immediate assessment of student writing skills.

Prior to the development of this form, CCWE maintained information on their students at various sites and aggregated data by class only. When funders requested demographic information, the Literacy Coordinator had to call class sites for approximate figures. With the implementation of the SDS form for all classes, that information can now be easily obtained.

The SDS was designed in two formats: one for native English speakers and one for ESL students. (Appendix 4). The SDS is administered by teachers and/or program coordinators to all students enrolled in classes coordinated by CCWE. New students will complete the forms and copies will be kept both by teachers and in the CCWE office.

Determining student goals or reasons for enrolling is key to CCWE's student-centered approach to workplace education. Previous experience has revealed that students often give very general reasons for enrolling in classes such as, "to learn English." CCWE had participated in a previous evaluation

study during which they developed a checklist of the most common goals for enrolling in their programs. This checklist was incorporated into the SDS, along with an additional line for "other" goals. Using this listing helps a student to identify specific reasons for attending classes. It also gives the instructor information about student interests and motivations.

A portion of the SDS is devoted to describing the employee/student's job. The purpose of this section is to elicit information about students' writing abilities in a low-stress situation. This brief writing exercise is completed in an informal manner as part of the completion of the form. The result is that the instructor has an idea of the student's writing ability in addition to his/her duties and activities while on the job. This helps to build a work-related curriculum.

The Student Data Sheets were administered to students in three classes by either the instructor or the program coordinator. The classes selected for administration of the forms were a GED class and two ESL classes. The classes chosen for data collection were made up of students who had been attending classes for over one year and would not be intimidated by the forms they would be asked to complete. A total of twenty-one students completed student data forms: four from the GED class, and seventeen from two ESL classes.

Findings

In analyzing the forms, CCWE's coordinator found that ESL students did not choose just one or two reasons for being enrolled in classes at their workplace. In fact, they checked almost every reason listed on the SDS as a goal of theirs. The ESL students identified job-related goals, such as speaking to a supervisor or co-worker as well as non-work related goals, such as speaking to neighbors or to their doctor.

In direct contrast to the ESL students, the GED students cited reasons related to self-improvement. They may not have cited work-related reasons for enrolling in classes due to the nature of their jobs. The four female GED students surveyed were home health care workers, all over the age of sixty years, who are paid barely above minimum wage. It is the Literacy Coordinator's opinion that they may not feel the need for higher skills to do their jobs and may not have any plans for advancement. Their goals are clearly personal, when compared to those of students from the ESL classes.

Instructors of the surveyed classes will retain copies of the Student Data Sheets completed by students and use the collected information to develop curricula that will benefit the student. Classroom activities that directly address the goals set by students can be planned when instructors have this kind of information at their disposal. It is hoped that later writing assignments will be compared to the brief job description on the student data form, to give the student and the instructor some idea of subsequent progress in that area.

At program sites taught by instructors from City Colleges, there was no initial assessment or inquiry into student goals because no structure had been created in which to do so. Now, these instructors have access to information about their students' motivation and some knowledge about their writing skills. CCWE plans to use this form at all program sites taught by City College teachers.

This student data sheet is now a part of CCWE's process of documenting student enrollment and progress. All new students will complete it, and the data from the forms will be maintained by class instructors and the CCWE office, as well. The data collected will be analyzed and used by the instructors to develop customized curricula, based on student goals. It will also be supplied to funders to assure them that CCWE is, indeed, reaching the numbers and populations it was designed to reach.

Evaluation Summary

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions

- To document who CCWE students are and what services they receive
  - ♦ Who are we serving?
  - ♦ What services are we providing?

Audiences

CCWE staff
Teachers
Funders
Students

Strategies/tasks

- Create intake instrument to determine "who" students are
- Collect and aggregate data by population and overall

Data collected/findings

- ESL students and GED students had different motivations for attending class; this may have been due to job situations

Program planning

- Individual student goals/writing samples will be shared with teachers to aid in curriculum development

For additional information or a copy of the Chicago Consortium for Worker Education's final report, contact the ILRDC office.

Site: Midwest Women's Center

Site Staff: Julie Kruse, Literacy Coordinator
Beth Fogel, Program Counselor
Wanda Fultz, Counselor

Level(s) of Evaluation: Formative Evaluation (Program Clarification)
Program Process (Progress Toward Objectives)

Midwest Women's Center's (MWC) is located in Chicago's South Loop area. This central location

makes it easy for women all over the city to participate in the programs it has to offer. The population served by MWC is primarily a mix of African American and Hispanic women over sixteen years of age. Recruitment is by public service announcements, word of mouth, visits to community organizations and public offices, and by referrals. Retention of students is aided by the Center's networking with other agencies which in turn, provide supportive services to their students. The Midwest Women's Center's Working Knowledge Program serves the educational needs (in reading, writing, and math) of women in the Chicago area with basic skill levels below sixth grade. Small group instruction in basic reading and writing (in content areas of literature, social and natural sciences) and in math is the foundation for their student-centered curriculum. These classes, taught by staff members and trained volunteers, provide sixteen hours of instruction per week to approximately one hundred women each year. Other related services, such as counseling, tutoring, employment training, and referrals are also provided.

Midwest Women's Center's application to the Quality Program's Project stated their goals very simply: to improve program design and methods of assessing and evaluating program and participant progress and to provide well documented evidence of program benefits (academic and nonacademic gains). While writing their plan to implement the framework, the site staff discovered that they needed to implement two levels of evaluation to achieve their goals, Formative Evaluation (level three) and Program Progress (level four).

Formative Evaluation (Program Clarification)

The goal of the project staff at this level was to find out which of the methods and materials currently being used in the Working Knowledge Educational Program were effective. The guiding and sub-guiding questions for the Midwest Women's Center team became:

How can we better serve our participants?

How can we improve curriculum design and implementation?

According to the Literacy Coordinator, one of the program's most pressing needs was to develop a method for documenting information exchanged at monthly teacher/tutor meetings. At these meetings, tutors and teachers discuss problems they are having implementing course curricula. Additionally, the progress of individual students is discussed during these sessions.

Midwest's team developed the Tutor Meeting Worksheet (appendix 5) to facilitate the documentation of problems identified by teachers and tutors during the monthly meetings and to guide their discussions toward solutions to those problems they identified. The worksheet was piloted and subsequently modified to meet the specific needs of the program. In its final form, the worksheet is designed to document class as well as individual participant progress, programmatic problems and possible solutions, and teacher/tutor comments regarding individual students or tutorial groups.

The Teacher/Tutor Meeting Worksheet has been successful in documenting information shared in monthly meetings. Comparing worksheets generated in these meetings on a regular basis can yield useful data on the effectiveness of the methods, materials, and the very structure of the Working Knowledge Program. The Center's staff has begun to document specific techniques and materials which, according to the tutors, work well with the participants. This worksheet has also proven useful by creating a record of "problem-solving by consensus" by staff during these meetings. Decisions related to program development are often made during these sessions which can have an impact upon the entire program. The Literacy Coordinator believes that it is important for records of these data be kept to show why certain programmatic decisions are made. It is hoped that the use of

this form will assist staff to better serve individual participants.

Findings

Since the worksheet did not evolve into its current form until late in the project, the MWC staff have not had the opportunity to compare worksheets from monthly meetings over any significant period of time. In the future, they hope to be able to review how programmatic decisions have occurred and to illustrate and document the staff's style of consensual program development.

Evaluation Summary of Level 3

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions

- To identify problems with curriculum design and implementation
  - ♦ How can we meet participant needs more effectively
  - ♦ How can we record information exchanged at teacher/tutor forums, especially problems identified and solutions reached?

Audiences

Program staff
Volunteers
Administrators
Current and Potential funders
Participants

Strategies/tasks

- Design meeting worksheet
- Meet with staff

Data collected/analysis

- Problems identified, solutions reached as recorded on worksheets from teacher/tutor forums

Program planning

- Program goals to be developed from monthly meeting

Program Progress (Progress Toward Objectives)

The goal of the project team at this level (level four) was to provide well documented evidence of program benefits in both academic and non-academic areas. The guiding question to be answered at this level was:

Are our participants making progress?

The project team indicated that the instruments they were using, the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) and the Session Oral Reading Test (SORT), were unsatisfactory for demonstrating participant

progress. Midwest Women's Center felt that program participants were making progress in many non-academic areas, including employability, interpersonal skills and particularly in the area of self-esteem. These were not being measured by the tests in use.

Therefore, the Midwest Women's Center team developed their own assessment instrument to measure these types of gains. A goal setting worksheet, which allows participants to set their own long-range, medium-range, short-range, and mini-goals (Appendix 5) was designed to be used in conjunction with counseling sessions. During these meetings, program staff and students discuss life goals and set up a plan identifying incremental steps toward those long-term goals. Students have an opportunity to identify and list barriers to reaching their goals as well as things which assist them in the process. Once students' goals are stated and recorded on the form, their success in achieving them will be evaluated on a monthly basis. Students will also be asked to respond to a weekly survey, in which they must indicate which goals they have reached and set for the week.

These exercises will serve as another measure of participant progress for teachers/tutors and participants. The project team also believes that participant involvement is a very important component in progress assessment. Knowledge of progress serves as a motivating factor for participants and allows them to guide the speed and direction of their individual progress.

Findings

Although some preliminary information regarding student's goals was included in their report, no analysis was done. The evaluation of this portion of the project was not to occur until June. At the time of this writing, no additional information has been provided to indicate which of the goals set were achieved.

As a result of the evaluation/assessment project undertaken by the MWC team, a closer connection between the instructional/tutoring and counseling components of the program has been established. Class activities are now planned in relation to the counseling services at MWC and with student goals in mind. Student goal-setting and self-assessment will remain part of the Working Knowledge Program and these activities will continue to illustrate the importance of including personal and career goals as well as academic ones when assessing/evaluating participant progress.

Evaluation Summary of Level 4

Purpose /guiding question and subquestions

- To provide "well-documented evidence" of non-academic gains made by students
  - Are our students making progress?

Audiences

Program counselor
Class instructors
Tutors
Agency administrators

Strategies/tasks

- Create goal setting forms

- Conduct individual counseling sessions
- Discuss career and life goals
- Complete goal setting form
- Administer weekly survey
- Perform monthly evaluations

Data collected/analysis

- Listing of goals set by participants

Program planning

- Closer connection between counseling and instructional components

- Weekly surveys planned

For additional information or a copy of the report, contact the ILRDC office.

Site:	The Neighborhood Institute
Site Staff:	Barbara Searles, Literacy Coordinator
Level(s) of Evaluation:	Formative Evaluation (Program Clarification) Program Progress (Progress Toward Objectives)

In the heart of the South Shore Community on Chicago's south side, The Neighborhood Institute (TNI) provides educational services, human resource development, real estate remodeling, housing assistance, and social service referrals. The Neighborhood Institute contributes to regeneration of its community by serving low to middle income families. This agency operates two locations in the South Shore Community: a small business development center, which houses its employment and training program and a center for residential and family services. It is in the latter of these two centers where educational, family support, and family literacy services are provided.

Formative Evaluation (Program Clarification)

This community-based organization's goals for the project included finding better ways to serve their participants. Prior to their involvement in the Quality Programs Project, TNI had conducted an assessment of their literacy program to gather data on students' perceived needs and their opinions on how program staff could better serve them. This assessment was conducted once a year. Preliminary results of these surveys indicated that students wanted to be a part of the curriculum development and the evaluation process. Students also said that they were interested in some type of pre-employment training. Based on these findings, some program changes had recently been made. To determine if students were satisfied with these changes, the literacy coordinator formed this guiding question:

> Were program changes implemented after analysis of a previous survey satisfactory to students?

The Literacy Coordinator wanted to ensure that the curriculum was developed around student goals. This integration of student goals into the curriculum would provide a contextual learning environment for the students in which they could begin to achieve the goals which they set for themselves. Learner progress would be measured through determining the number of goals the learners attained. If the learners attained their goals, then the learners would be progressing and the program would be meeting the needs of the learners.

Based on these concepts and student interests demonstrated by the survey, the curriculum was restructured and different instructional materials were chosen. To address the student's request for pre-employment training, class periods were revamped to include one hour of life skills training in addition to the two hours of basic skills instruction previously taught. During the life skills class, students learn how to complete employment applications, obtain necessary supportive services for their families and information on careers. Additionally, class instructors and tutors developed, for the first time, weekly lesson plans which incorporated the students' choices for subject content (see Appendix 6 for Lesson Plan Form).

After these changes were put in place, the Literacy Coordinator re-administered the survey to the students. The assessment instrument was revised to include open-ended questions to allow students the opportunity to provide insightful, "off-the-cuff" comments about the program (Appendix 6). To counteract the hesitancy some students might feel from the open-ended questions, the Literacy Coordinator included a rating scale (5 = excellent; 1 = poor) for students to assess specific aspects of the program such as class content, instructors, materials (including books), classroom space, and the overall program.

Findings

Thirty-nine assessments were completed and returned. The results of the survey indicated that the overall academic needs of the students were being met by the services offered and that they were satisfied with their own individual progress as well. The only programmatic change identified by students was the need for more computer learning materials.

By the end of the Institute's participation in the project, the new class schedule (2 hours basic skills and 1 hour life skills training) had become a permanent part of TNI's program. Also, the idea of including students in the assessment process is now firmly planted in the minds of program planners for literacy services at this site. It may be necessary to allow the assessment tools to evolve slowly to correspond to a changing program format. Lesson plans from teachers, submitted for the first time this term, will continue to incorporate the needs of students as determined through the assessment process.

In direct response to the student's request for increased computer learning materials, TNI's administrators have already approved additional software in various subjects at different levels for the Fall term. By the end of 1992, another assessment will be conducted

---

Evaluation Summary of Level 3

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions

- To determine student satisfaction with program changes
  - How can we make students part of the processes of curriculum development and evaluation?

Audiences

Program staff
Students
Volunteers
Agency administrators

Strategies/tasks

- Analyze previous student need survey
- Change class schedule
- Select different class materials
- Revise student assessment form
- Select instructor lesson plan form

Data collected/analysis

- Quantitative data
- Student ratings of program
- Qualitative data
- Student satisfaction with program, progress, accomplishments

Program planning

- Teachers must submit lesson plans, incorporating some student goals into class activities
- Program acquiring more software to expand computer assisted instruction

---

Program Progress (Progress Toward Objectives)

According to TNI, the Institute's literacy program has an excellent record of achieving twice the educational gain in a three-month period as required by the City of Chicago's job training program. However, the program's coordinator knows that grade level gains are not the only gains students make in the program. Therefore, the goal for The Neighborhood Institute staff at this level (level four) became to find a way to document and/or measure observable behaviors that indicate student progress using methods other than those conventionally used in literacy programs. The guiding question to be answered at level four was:

Are our students setting realistic goals and achieving them?

Prior to The Neighborhood Institute's participation in the QPP, students were evaluated every three to six months. Since previous studies have shown that progress occurs in incremental steps, especially in literacy programs, it is conceivable that incremental gains of a non-academic nature were being missed during the time between evaluations. The Quality Programs Project Coordinator suggested that students be allowed to set long and short-term goals and be evaluated on steps they take toward achieving those goals on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.

Upon review of the Student Agreement Form used by the program, the Literacy Coordinator determined that it needed to be revised. The revised version of the form (Appendix 6) allowed students to record their goals, the steps they planned to use to reach them, and the time period in

which they proposed to achieve them. This strategy was employed to provide students with a specific and unified plan on paper. Soon after this new form was implemented, the Literacy Coordinator reviewed the students goals and discovered that most of them had not made any significant progress toward the goals they had set at the beginning of the term.

To assist students in meeting their expectations, large calendars with open squares corresponding to the days of the week were distributed. The students were told to keep weekly records of their activities toward reaching their goals. Instead of filling out individual goal forms at the beginning of the term and possibly forgetting about them, the students now had a daily and a weekly reminder. According to the Literacy Coordinator, regular recording of their activities would help students keep on track while in pursuit of their goals. By using this method, they were able to identify manageable steps that they could use to attain their goals. This process also gave the students confidence as well as a sense of achievement on a daily basis. This in turn became a motivational factor.

The student goal calendars will be reviewed once a month by program staff. Completed calendars are copied and retained in the students' files.

Findings

As reported in the previous section discussing the Institute's implementation of level three, the students were asked to complete the student assessment form (Appendix 6). Although some of the questions assessed programmatic content, others, specifically questions 4, 5 and 6, were related to student goals and achieving them. The results were based on information contained on those same thirty nine completed surveys.

According to the analysis done by the program's Literacy Coordinator, 85% of the thirty-nine responding participants had achieved less than 50% of their stated goals. The reasons given included poor attendance, personal problems, and not adhering to the weekly goal-setting process. Ninety-two percent of the responding participants stated they felt the weekly goal-setting was beneficial.

As a result of this information, the revised Student Agreement form is now used as a part the intake process. The completion of this form leads directly into the weekly goal-setting scheme using the calendar. This process will be incorporated into the curriculum as a life skills class activity. In addition, this process will ultimately affect curriculum planning, given the decision of the Institute to incorporate student goals into goals for their literacy program.

Those who will benefit most from the information gained from the setting of student goals and how students achieve them are the students themselves. The Program Coordinator, tutors, and teachers will all be recipients of this information eventually, since this program has made the commitment to allow student goals to become part of its curriculum. Although no specific plans have been stated, it is likely that these findings will be shared in curriculum planning sessions, tutoring sessions, and student conferences.

Evaluation Summary of Level 4

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions

- To find a way to document observable behaviors that indicate student progress
  - Are our students getting realistic goals and achieving them?

Audiences

Program coordinator
Teachers
Tutors
Students

Strategies/tasks

- Revise Student Agreement Form (SAF)
- Distribute goal-setting calendars
- Review calendars monthly

Data collected/analysis

- Qualitative data on students' goals set and reached

Program planning

- Administer revised SAF in intake process
- Class activity (life skills)
- Breaking goals down into weekly tasks aimed at reaching them
- Use calendar to set weekly goals and record steps toward achievement

---

For additional information or a copy of The Neighborhood Institute's final report, contact The Neighborhood Institute; 1750 E. 71st Street; Chicago, IL 60649.

Site:	Firman Community Services
Site Staff:	Karen Spivey, Literacy Program Director Sheryl Blakely, Student
Level(s) of Evaluation:	Program Progress (Progress Toward Objectives)

Firman Community Services (FCS) is the smallest program involved in this project. This community-based program is part of a much larger agency that provides many services at several different sites ranging from counseling to providing emergency food and clothing. Firman's literacy program is located on Chicago's south side and is near one of the largest public housing developments in the city, the Robert Taylor Homes. Students for the program are recruited by word-of-mouth, community presentations, referrals from other programs within the agency, and outside referrals. Approximately 35 students are served each year and since the program is so small, one-on-one tutoring is the primary method of instruction.

Due to Firman's location and the types of services it must provide, the Literacy Program Director is very familiar with the effects of low skill levels, welfare dependency, unemployment, and low self-esteem upon the lives of program participants These factors significantly impact a student's perception of progress. Although students' scores on standardized tests may remain the same or, indeed, decrease from one administration to the next, significant changes often occur in their lives

that are not measured by a test.

The Director's goal for this project was to develop alternative assessment/evaluation tools to document student progress. Because student portfolios were already being kept by staff, the Literacy Program Director surmised that they could somehow be used to document progress. Therefore, her question become:

> What indicators of student progress can be derived from work samples which are collected in a student portfolio?

As a first step in the process, the coordinator reviewed all 30 student portfolios on hand. Work samples had been collected for these portfolios over the period of each student's enrollment. The coordinator's review was based on the assumption that the material in these folders was somewhat consistent and could be used to determine indicators of student progress. It was her belief that these indicators could be further refined and developed into a tool for measuring individual progress.

After the preliminary review, a more in-depth analysis of the contents of three sample folders was done. There were two goals in conducting this analysis, 1. to determine which items were "standard" within the portfolios, and 2. to reveal which of the standard items already demonstrated student progress. Her analysis revealed that each portfolio contained: anecdotal records, student comments, intake information, book lists, math samples, writing samples, attendance records and student goals. Of these, writing samples, book lists, and math samples were classified as demonstrating tangible evidence of achievement. Therefore, these items were broken into component parts. For example, student book lists included title, author, number of pages, and readability. The coordinator believed that to demonstrate progress for an individual student, the number of pages or number of books documented by means of the booklist could be compared over time.

To ensure portfolio consistency and to document individual progress, the coordinator developed a checklist for portfolio review (Appendix 7). The checklist included a yes/no format to document the presence of work samples. While the checklist in this format could be used to standardize the contents of future portfolios, it was not yet structured to measure student progress. In an effort to correct this, the coordinator revised the checklist to include spaces for progress scales, tutor comments and pre- and post- test scores. Thus, the checklist could be used as a "snapshot" of an individual student's learning situation at a particular time or, when compared to a baseline, the checklist could be used to document progress.

Findings

After creating the checklist, a new sample of three portfolios was reviewed using the checklist as a guide. This review demonstrated the usefulness of the checklist in providing instructional information related to the individual students. However, since no baseline data had been collected, it was difficult to systematically document student progress. Nevertheless, the Coordinator's intimate knowledge of the students did allow her to make some general comments on individual advancement. For example, she noted that Student A had several writing samples in her portfolio. These writing samples showed clear progress in length, going from just 1-2 lines to entire pages. The content of the samples also showed progress over time in that the student began incorporating her own thoughts and ideas into the samples.

During the writing of this report, the Literacy Program Director resigned and was unable to implement any changes prior to her departure. She did, however, make some recommendations for program changes, based on the results of this project. The suggestions were as follows:

1. Standardize the contents of each student portfolio.

2. Train all staff and volunteers on proper documentation procedures.

3. Use the checklist to begin a quarterly review of each student's portfolio.

Potentially, an evaluation of student portfolios has implications for students, instructors, program coordinators and funders. Students need to know that the sum total of the efforts they expend in literacy programs means more than a SORT score that may be lower than the one they received a few weeks earlier. Keeping student work in an organized format, such as a portfolio, can give them an appreciation for the quantity and quality of the work they produce.

Program coordinators and instructors can use portfolios to document student progress. Regular use of such a system of evaluation can provide a wealth of information on student successes that might otherwise be ignored.

Funders should be made aware that students in literacy programs make progress and enjoy success in areas that standardized testing cannot measure. The fact that such progress is not measured by traditional means should not diminish the importance of the achievement. Literacy providers have a duty to their students, current and potential, to inform funders of alternative methods of assessing the kinds of progress students actually make while enrolled in literacy programs.

Evaluation Summary of Level 4

Purpose/guiding question and subquestions

- To create a systematic way of collecting and reviewing student's work to document progress

  - What indicators of student progress can be derived from work samples collected in a student portfolio?

Audiences

Students
Instructors
Program coordinators
Funders

Strategies/tasks

- Preliminary review of all student portfolios for standard content and indicators of progress
- Review random sample
- Discuss contents
- Compile checklist items
- Review sample portfolios using checklist

Data collected/analysis

- Anecdotal records
- Booklists

- Writing assignments
- Math assignments

Program planning

- Recommended (by immediate past coordinator)
- Standardize contents of portfolios
- Train staff and volunteers in documentation/anecdotal records
- Quarterly portfolio review using checklist

For additional information or a copy of Firman Community Service's final report, contact the ILRDC office.

OTHER FINDINGS

No matter how bad or how good the assessment instruments, they are meaningless and won't demonstrate progress if class attendance is poor. When the Midwest Women's Center's staff met to discuss their participation in the Quality Programs Project, they discussed their biggest problems in serving their program's participants. Poor participant attendance was at the top of the list of all staff members. Their major complaint was that class material had to be re-taught when absentees come back to class, so regular attendees were bored with the slow pace. During consultations and tutoring sessions, teachers and tutors had asked students why they did not come to class regularly. The overwhelming consensus of the students was that class material was too repetitive due to high absenteeism among their peers.

Staff members decided that a new attendance policy, drafted by students and staff, would create higher levels of responsibility and motivation in their students. The result of this collaboration yielded a new attendance policy that is embodied in a contract that must be signed by participants and program staff (Appendix 8). The terms of the contract require the women who attend classes at MWC to take full responsibility for their compliance to the new policy. They must call in when they are absent and submit written explanation of absences upon their return to classes. If they are not provided with a medical excuse, the written explanation for their absence, in most cases, must be composed by the absentee. Excessive absences (more than three per month) are cause for a counseling session with counselor and literacy coordinator and one month's probation follows this session. Continued absences during probationary period are cause for expulsion from the program.

The new attendance policy was evaluated after three months. The results of the new policy, as reported by staff, were that it had a positive effect upon the program participants. Specifically, overall attendance increased from 74% to 82%. More importantly though, the students became more responsible for their attendance and their absences. At the same time, the students accepted more responsibility for other aspects of their lives such as completing homework assignments and following through with daily tasks in their personal lives. The new attendance policy was retained and is currently a regular part of the MWC program.

CONCLUSION

During the course of this project, we have seen the ILRDC evaluation framework applied to adult literacy programs which, in some cases, function differently from the family literacy programs for

which the framework was originally intended. The six programs we worked with used the different levels of the framework to create assessment systems and tools that were tailor-made for their programs and the goals they were trying to achieve. Each program worked through its own process of assessment and ended the project with results that had a positive impact upon their programs. We can conclude from this that the framework is flexible enough to be applied to almost any literacy program, at any evaluation level.

The first training session immediately illustrated the value and importance of working together as a group. The discussions that took place between the participants during that session were an act of confirmation for all concerned. The experience of working together in those sessions greatly diminished the feelings of isolation and "suffering in silence" that most program providers endure. Their enthusiasm about their work and their concerns about students and their progress bound them together in a collaborative learning experience that set the tone for the remainder of the sessions and the project.

One of the major hurdles of this project was getting the program participants to narrow the focus of their plans for the project and set realistic goals. The time frame of the project was a stumbling block to many, in that their plans were extensive enough to take at least two or three program years to complete. Upon reviewing their proposals, the ILRDC team noticed the extent of their goals and took it as a sign of their programs' visions for program evaluation and development. When the project began, QPP staff emphasized the need to focus on the programs' most pressing issues concerning assessment and evaluation.

It was gratifying to see that a couple of our participating programs wanted to work on two levels of evaluation simultaneously. This was an indication to the project staff that the concept of the interrelationship of the evaluation levels and program components was understood and accessible. Those programs engaging in "bi-level" evaluation found that it was possible to do, but at the same time, very time-consuming.

Staff turnover at the program sites was very prevalent during the course of this project. In fact, a literacy coordinator from one of the participating programs left at the beginning of the project, and by the end of it, she had been hired to replace another coordinator at another one of the participating sites. Staff turnover was also partially responsible for the alteration of goals in the midst of the project, at another site. We also learned that a change in staff coordinators can alter the goals of the program.

One of our objectives for this project was to help participating sites build evaluation and assessment into their program designs. According to those who participated in this project, we have successfully done that. Additionally, we hope that we have created, by compiling descriptions of their work and their tools into this report, a resource that will enable other program providers to begin thinking about evaluation and assessment in a very different way.

The success of this project is due to the flexibility of the primary tool we used: the ILRDC evaluation framework, the willingness of our participants to accept a challenge and to rise to the occasion, and the collaborative experience arising from working as a group and from the technical assistance efforts. This project confirms our previous conclusion that all programs can develop evaluation plans that suit their needs, implement them, and get results that will improve the services provided.

Bibliography

ILRDC, (1990), *The Mechanics of Success for Families, Report #1, Family Literacy Programs*. Rantoul, IL: Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center.

ILRDC, (1990), *The Mechanics of Success for Families, Report #2, Evaluation*. Rantoul, IL: Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center.

ILRDC, (1992), *Fine Tuning the Mechanics of Success for Families, Report #3, Family Literacy Programs*. Rantoul, IL: Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center.

Jacobs, F. H., (1988), The Five Tiered Approach to Evaluation: Context and Implementation. In H. B. Weiss and F. H. Jacobs (Eds), *Evaluating Family Programs*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine DeGruyter.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our heartfelt thanks to those who made this report possible. First, we must acknowledge the extensive time and effort spent by the staff members at each program site. These dedicated individuals not only created evaluation tools for their own sites, but they spent many hours putting together reports and descriptions of their work. Doubtless, many other staff members at the sites also put in time, but we would like to expressly thank the following individuals:

Debbie Both and Ellen Murphy, Onward Neighborhood House
Paula Garcia, Chicago Consortium for Worker Education
Julie Kruse, Beth Fogel, and Wanda Fultz, Midwest Women's Center
Susan Pinner, Youth Services Project
Barbara Searles, The Neighborhood Institute
Karen Spivey, Firman Community Services

We would also like to commend the ILRDC staff involved in the project. Specifically we thank Gwen Walls Talley who worked with site staff and prepared the first draft of the report, Roxanne Allison who shaped the final version from the original draft, Suzanne Knell and Barbara Geissler who provided direction and feedback throughout the process, Katherine Ryan who provided expert consultation on all aspects of evaluation for the project, and Marty Milton and Thelma Budzienski who supported the rest of us every step of the way.

Financial support for this work came largely from the Lloyd A. Fry Foundation and the Chicago Tribune Charities. We are particularly appreciative of the help and support of Ann Billingsley and Marge Brannon.

—ILRDC Board of Directors

The Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center

The Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center is a not-for-profit organization supported by the Illinois State Board of Education-Adult Education and Literacy Section, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Joyce Foundation, Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, Lloyd A. Fry Foundation, Robert R. McCormick Tribune Foundation, and Polk Bros. Foundation.

The Center began operation in 1987 with a "Literacy Challenge Grant". The grant was given to the Center based on the demonstrated cooperative efforts of the six major literacy entities in the state. Since 1987, the Center has branched out to address issues in the areas of workforce education, family literacy, resource development, policy and evaluation/assessment. The Center's cooperative, inclusive model creates a vehicle for grassroots providers to meet with interested parties from the public and private sectors to share information, create strategies, and impact policy.

Working in the areas of workforce education, family literacy, public policy and resource development, the ILRDC takes a leadership role in identifying and addressing emerging issues affecting the literacy field. Through publications, reports and a quarterly newsletter, the Center furnishes information to interested individuals and agencies on a local, state and national level. ILRDC staff members also provide technical assistance and consultation in literacy related areas.

APPENDIX 1

Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center
Quality Programs Project

1. Please give a brief description of your program (i.e. goals/mission of the organization, what services you provide, recruitment and retention strategies, curriculum, etc.)

2. Why are you committed to improving the design and assessment/evaluation aspects of your program?

3. What are your goals in being part of this project?

4. As part of this project, what aspects of your program design and evaluation would you like to work on?

5. When do classes begin in 1992?

6. Will you be able to dedicate staff time to this project?

7. Will at least one staff member be available to attend 3 mandatory full day training sessions over the course of the year?

APPENDIX 2

Name _____

Adult/Parent Interview Family Literacy Project

1. How long have you lived in the area? _____

2. How many children do you have? _____

   A. Ages: _____

   B. Program participated in? (Head Start, Day Care, etc.)

   _____

3. Marital Status: Single _____
   Married _____
   Separated/Divorced _____
   Widowed _____

   A. How many people live in your household? _____

   B. Ethnic Group:

   _____ Mexican _____ Black _____ Guatemalan _____ Other (specify)

   _____ Puerto Rican _____ Italian _____ Other White _____

   C. Age:

   _____ 18-25 _____ 45-54

   _____ 26-34 _____ 55-64

   _____ 35-44 _____ 64 and over

   D. If you are not the child's parent, how are you related to the child?

   _____

   E. Primary language spoken at home? _____

   F. How many years did you attend school? _____

   Where? _____

   G. Employment:

   Full-Time _____
   Part-Time _____
   Unemployed or Laid Off _____
   Job Training _____
   Retired _____

H. Annual Household Income:

____ 0-$9,999 ____ $10,000-$14,999 ____ $15,000 or more

What kinds of things are you interested in?
What do you enjoy during your free time?

_____

_____

_____

4. Have you ever participated in any of the following activities? How often? (per yea

	Yes, I have participated	How often
* Parent/Teacher Conferences		
* Parent Meeting		
* Attending Special Event (like Bake Sale or Tag Day)		
* Attending Adult Education Classes (ESL, GED, etc.)		
* Trips		
* Volunteering in special projects (decorating, bulletin boards, etc.)		
* Observing Classroom activites		

4.A. Other situations _____ How often _____

(specify) _____

5. How important do you think it is that parents/adults participate in the following activities?

	Very Important 5	4	3	2	Not Important 1
Parent/Teacher meeting	____	____	____	____	____
Parent Meeting	____	____	____	____	____
Attending Special Event	____	____	____	____	____
Attending Adult Education Classes	____	____	____	____	____
Trips	____	____	____	____	____
Volunteering in Special Projects	____	____	____	____	____
Volunteering in classroom activities	____	____	____	____	____
Observing classroom activities	____	____	____	____	____
Other _____	____	____	____	____	____

6. What things do you do with your child?

_____ Go to the library
_____ Play together
_____ Read stories together
_____ Listen to child's reading/stories/songs
_____ Talk with child about day's activities
_____ Watch T.V.
_____ Help child make things
_____ Do homework
_____ Other (please explain) _____

_____

7. What things would you like to do with your child, but don't (for whatever reason, ie. lack of time, etc.)

_____ Go to the library
_____ Play together
_____ Read stories together
_____ Listen to child's reading/stories/songs
_____ Talk with child about day's activities
_____ Watch T.V.
_____ Help child make things
_____ Do homework
_____ Other (please explain) _____

_____

8. Are there activities that you can't do with your child? _____

_____

9. What kinds of things would you like to learn for yourself? (Learn English, get a GED, math, how to help your child with homework, etc.)_____

_____

10. What kinds of things is your child or children most interested in? (reading, drawing, painting, playing etc.) _____

_____

11. Do you want your child to continue his or her education? _____

_____

12. Specifically, what do you want your child to do with his or her education?

_____

13. Do you think it is important for parents to help children learn? _____

_____ Yes _____ somewhat important

_____ Not Important _____ not sure

14. How do you think parents/adults can help their children learn?

_____ Visit child's teacher

_____ Talk with children about day's activities

_____ Read stories together

_____ Listen to child read/act out stories

_____ Play together

_____ Help children make things

_____ Do homework together

15. In your opinion, what is the most important thing a parent/adult can do to help their child learn? _____

_____

16. What kinds of activities would most help your family to help your child learn?

_____ Workshops emphasizing, (including "How To" and practicing), the importance of reading to your child

_____ Child Development workshop series

_____ Parent/Child partnerships in reading (Family story time)

_____ Parent/Child partnerships in writing

_____ Workshops instructing "How To" support your children's efforts in school

_____ Parent/Child activities (play, art)

_____ Cultural Orientation and Awareness

_____ English as a Second Language classes

_____ Literacy Instruction (in Spanish and/or English)

_____ Workshops focusing on "How To" get involved in school policy and decision making

_____ Pre-GED/GED (Spanish _____) (English _____)

_____ Job readiness and employability skills

_____ Vocational Training workshops

_____ Other (specify) _____

What are the three most important activities? _____

17. Would you be interested in participating in family activities at Onward House?

_____

17.A When would you be most willing to attend these activities?

Morning _____ (specify time) _____

Afternoon _____ (specify time) _____

Evening _____ (specify time) _____

B. How often?

_____ Daily

_____ Twice a week

_____ Once per week

_____ Monthly

_____ Other (specify) _____

18. What would prevent you from participating in Family activities at Onward House?

_____

_____

Nombre

CUESTIONARIO PARA EL PROYECTO FAMILIAR DE ALFABETIZACION

1. Cuanto tiempo ha vivido Ud. en este area? _____

2. Cuantos niños tiene? _____

   A. Cuantos años tienen ellos? _____

   B. En cuales programas participan sus niño (s)? (Head Start, Day Care)

   _____

3. Su estado civil:

   Soltero _____

   Casado _____

   Separado/Divorciado _____

   Viudo/a _____

   A. Cuantas personas viven en su casa? _____

   B. Cual es su grupo etnico:

   ____ Mexicano ___Moreno ___Guatemalteco ____ Otro

   ____ Puerto Riqueño ___Italiano ____Caucásico

   C. Entre cual categoria cae su edad?

   ____ 18-25 ___45-54

   ____ 26-34 ___55-64

   ____ 35-44 ___64 and over

   D. Si no es padre del niño, que es su relación al niño?

   _____

   E. Que idioma usa en su casa? _____

   F. Cuantos años estudio Ud. en la escuela? _____

   Dónde? ____ _____

   G. Ud. trabaja?

   Tiempo completo _____ medio tiempo _____

   Sin trabajo _____ Entrenamiento de empleo _____

   Retirado _____

   H. Cuanto dinero gana su familia cada año?

   ____ 0-$9,999 ____$10,000 - $14,999 ____$15,000 o más

Que tipo de cosas le gusta hacer o sea que le disfruta hacer durante su tiempo libre?

_____

_____

_____

4. Ha participado en algunas de las actividades siguientes? Algunas veces?

	Si, he participado	Cuantas veces cada a
*Reunion individual con la maestra		
*Reunion de los padres		
*Participando un evento especial (como una venta de postres o "tag day"		
*Asistiendo clases de educacion para los adultos (clases de ingles o GED, etc.		
*Viajes		
*Ha sido un voluntario en proyectos especiales (decoraciones, pizzaron)		
*Ha sido un voluntario en actividades de clase de su nino (leyendo, juegos,etc.)		
*Observando las actividades do la clase de su nino		

4A. Otras situaciones_____cuantas veces cada ano_____

(especifique)_____

5. Que importancia le da Ud. la participacion do los padres/adultos en las actividades siguientes?

	Muy importante 5	4	3	2	No es importan: 1
*Reunión individual con la maestra	____	____	____	____	____
*Reunión de los padres	____	____	____	____	____
*Asistiendo un evento especial	____	____	____	____	____
*Asistiendo clases de inglés para los adultos	____	____	____	____	____
*Viajes	____	____	____	____	____
*Ser un voluntario en proyectos especiales	____	____	____	____	____
*Ser un voluntario en actividades de clase de su niño	____	____	____	____	____
*Observando las actividades de clase de su nino	____	____	____	____	____
*Otro_____	____	____	____	____	____

6. Que cosas hace con su niño?

____Va a la biblioteca

____Juegan juntos

____Les lee cuentos

____Les escucha lo que ellos estan leyendo, diciendo, cantando

____Les pregunta de las actividades diarias

____Mira la televición

____Le ayuda hacer cosas

____Le ayuda con su tarea

____Otras actividades (explique por favor)_____

_____

7. Que cosas le gustaría hacer con su niño, pero no las hacen por cualquier razón? (por ejemplo, le falta tiempo, etc.)

_____ Va a la biblioteca

_____ Juegan juntos

_____ Les lee cuentos

_____ Les escucha lo que ellos estan leyendo, diciendo, cantando

_____ Les pregunta de las actividades diarias

_____ Mira la televicion

_____ Le ayuda hacer cosas

_____ Le ayuda con su tarea

_____ Otras actividades (explique por favor)_____

_____

8. Hay algunas actividades que no puede hacer con su niño? _____

_____

9. Que cosas le gustaría aprender para si mismo? (Aprender ingles, matematicas, como ayudar su niño hacer su tarea, etc.) _____

_____

10. Cuales cosas le interesa lo más a su niño? (leyendo, dibujando, pintando, jugando, etc.) _____

_____

11. Tiene aspiraciónes para su niño y su educación? _____

_____

12. Especificamente, cuales son las aspiraciónes que tiene Ud.? _____

_____

13. Piensa que es importante que los padres les ayuden aprender sus niños?

_____ Si _____ mas o menos

_____ No importante _____ no estoy seguro

14. Como piensa Ud. que los padres/adultos les pueden ayudar a sus niños a aprender?

_____ Visita a la maestra de su niño

_____ Hablando con su niño de las actividades diarias

_____ Leyendo cuentos juntos

_____ Escuchando a su niño leer/actuar cuentos

_____ Jugando juntos

_____ Ayudando su niño hacer cosas/hacer la tarea juntos

15. En su opinión, que es la cosa más importante que un padre/adulto puede hacer para ayudar a su niño aprender? _____

_____

16. Cuales tipos de actividades le ayudaría a su familia lo mas a ayudará su niño aprender?

_____ Talleres con enfasis, (incluyendo "Como" y practicando) la importancia de leer a su niño.

_____ Una serie de talleres que se tratan con el desarrollo de los niños

_____ Padres y niños como compañeros en leer (Family Story Time)

_____ Padres y niños como un compañero en escribir

_____ Talleres que les instruyen a los padres como apoyar los esfuerzos de sus niños en la escuela

_____ Actividades para los padres y sus niños juntos

_____ Orientacion sobre culturas

_____ Clases de inglés

_____ Clases de alfabetizacion (Español _____) (Inglés _____)

_____ Talleres enfocando en como involverse en las decisiones y las policas de la escuela

_____ Pre-GED/GED (Español _____) (Inglés _____)

_____ Preparacion para obtener empleo y talleres de entrenamiento al nivel vocacional

_____ Otras (especifica) _____

Cuales son las tres actividades mas importantes?_____

17. Le interesaría a participar en actividades Familiares en Onward House?

_____

17.A. Cuando le gustaría asistir estas actividades? (Indique primera opcion, segunda opcion, y tercera opcion)

por la mañana _____ (especifica la hora) _____

por la tarde _____ (especifica la hora) _____

por la tarde pasando 5 pm _____ (especifica la hora) _____

17.B. Cuantas veces?

_____ Diario

_____ Dos veces por semana

_____ Una vez por semana

_____ Una vez por mensual

_____ Otro (especificar) _____

18. Que le prevenirìa de participar en actividades familiares en Onward House?

_____

Name _____ Program _____

FAMILY LITERACY PROJECT SURVEY TEACHERS/PROGRAM COORDINATORS

Please take time to answer these questions which will help us to develop an effective Family Literacy Program.

1. How many families do you have in your program? _____

2. What is the average family size of those families you've listed? (example: 3 children and two adults etc.)

_____

3. List number of parents, according to the information requested.

a. Marital Status

Single _____ Male _____
Female _____

Married Couple _____ (count a couple as 1)

Divorced or Separated _____

b. Ethnic Group:

_____ Mexican _____ Black _____ Guatemalan _____ Other (Specify)
_____ Puerto Rican _____ Italian _____ Other White

c. Age:

_____ 18-25 _____ 45-54
_____ 26-34 _____ 55-64
_____ 35-44 _____ 64 and over

How many families have other relatives living in the home, i.e. grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.? _____

d. Employment: Full-Time _____
Part-Time _____
Unemployed or laid off _____
Job Training _____
Retired _____

e. Primary language parents speak at home? _____

f. Average years of education _____
U.S. or other (please specify) _____

4. How many parents of children in your program did you see this past year in the following activities? How often?

	How many parents participated?	How Often? (per yea
Home Visit		
Informally (when parents drop off or pick-up child)		
*Formally (individual parent/teacher meetings)		
*Attending Parent Meeting		
*Attending special event (such as bake sale, tag day)		
*Attending Adult Education classes (ESL, GED etc.)		
*Trips		
*Volunteering (special projects- decorations, bulletin boards, etc.)		
*Volunteering in classroom activities- reading, games, etc.)		
*Observing Classroom activities		

4.A. Other situations _____ How often _____ (specify) _____

_____

5. How important do you think that parents participate in the following activities?

	Very Important 5	4	3	2	Not Important 1
Individual parent/teacher meeting	___	___	___	___	___
Attending Parent meeting	___	___	___	___	___
Attending special event	___	___	___	___	___
Attending Adult Education classes	___	___	___	___	___
Trips	___	___	___	___	___
Volunteering in special projects	___	___	___	___	___
Volunteering in classroom activities	___	___	___	___	___
Observing classroom activities	___	___	___	___	___
Other _____	___	___	___	___	___

6 In your opinion, what kind of activities would most help parents and other family members help their children learn?

____Workshops emphasizing, (including "How To" and practicing), the importance of reading to their child.

____Child Development workshop series

____Parent/Child partnerships in reading (Family storytime)

____Parent/Child partnerships in writing

____Workshops instructing "How To" support children's efforts in school

____Parent/Child activities (play, art) which recognize parents as primary teachers of their children

____Activities to build self-esteem

____Cultural Orientation and Awareness

____English as a Second Language classes

____Literacy Instruction (Spanish and/or English)

____Workshops focusing on "How To" get involved in school policy and decision making

____Pre-GED/GED (Spanish_____) (English_____)

____Job readiness and employability skills

____Vocational Training workshops

____Other (specify)_____

Choose the three activities from the listing above you feel would be most helpful to parents and other family members to help their children learn?_____

_____

7. Do you think parents would be interested in participating in family activities at Onward House?_____

7A. When do you think parents would be most willing to attend these activities?

Morning_____(specify time)_____

Afternoon_____(specify time)_____

Evening_____(specify time)_____

7B. How often?

_____Daily

_____Twice per week

_____Once per week

_____Monthly

_____Other (specify)_____

8. What do you think would prevent parents from participating in family activities at Onward House?_____

_____

9. What are some of the specific needs your parents have which a Family Literacy program could help with? (please explain on the back of the page)

APPENDIX 3

Dear TAP Peer Group Facilitators and TAP Staff Members:

Please take a few moments of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire.

During the past few months, I have been working on a project to add family literacy to our current educational services. I thought that it might be possible to link the Teen Parenting and Literacy Programs by providing reading activities to the mothers and their children. The initial phase of the project has been to find out whether there is a need or even an interest in this type of programming.

With this in mind, my guiding questions are:

1. Are YSP TAP program participants interested in family literacy (parent/child reading activities)?

2. Is there a need for such services?

3. Is it possible to create such a link within our agency?

I hope that the survey will give me insight into the answers to these questions. ***With your help, it is a beginning!*** Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Susan Pinner
Literacy Supervisor

Teens Adapting to Parenting
Educational Interest Survey
for Peer Group Facilitators and TAP Counselors

1. How many teen mothers attend each of the weekly TAP support groups?

   a. Of those, how many participants receive public aid?

   b. How many participants work?

   c. Of those that work, what kind of jobs do they have?

   d. How many of the mothers are married?

2. Are the mothers the only supporters of their child (children)?

   _____YES _____NO

If you checked no, who helps them to support their child (children)?

3. On average, how old are the mothers in your group?

4. a. How many years of school have your group participants completed?

b. How many participants in your group have a high school diplomas?

c. Are any mothers currently attending school or a training institute?

_____YES _____NO

If so, what schools or training institutes?

5. Based on your interviews, group discussions, and observations of the teen mothers, what kind of educational help do the participants need?

_____Pass the GED examination

_____Learn to read

_____Be better spellers

_____Improve their math skills

_____Help their children with homework

_____Help their children learn to read

_____Assistance with finding training institutes or colleges

_____Learn to speak english

Please list any other educational needs that you noted in your work with the teen mothers:

6. How long does the average girl participate in the TAP program or group?

7. What does the TAP program consist of? Please check one or all:

_____Counseling services

_____Attending literacy, English, or GED classes

_____Field trips

_____Weekly support groups

_____volunteering

_____Activities with their children

Please list any others activities that are a part of the program and/or groups:

8. How do you think the mothers feel when they participate in the TAP program and/or groups?

_____Comfortable

_____Angry

_____Uncomfortable

_____Anxious

_____Happy

_____Sad

_____Nervous

_____Excited

_____Smarter
(Like they've learned something)

_____Okay

_____Encouraged

Please list any other emotions you perceive during the groups:

9. Do the mothers bring their children to group?

_____Yes, always _____No, never _____Yes, sometimes

10. Based on your interviews, group discussions and observations, please answer the following questions,

a. Do you think the young parents come to group to be with other moms or to be with their children?

b. Do they have other reasons for coming? Please tell me some of these:

11. Do you think it is important *to the mothers* that the children learn something while they participate in the group session?

_____ Yes, it's very important to them.

_____ No, it's not important to them.

_____ Yes, it's somewhat important to them.

_____ I'm not sure if it's important to them.

12. Do you think it is important *to the mothers* that they help their children learn and prepare for school?

_____Yes, it's very important to them.

_____No, it's not important to them.

_____Yes, it's somewhat important to them.

_____I'm not sure if it's important to them.

13. Do you think it would be beneficial to the young moms if there were parent/child educational activities included in the group meetings?

_____ YES _____ NO

a. What kind of activities would be most beneficial or would the moms enjoy the most?

_____Learn the alphabet

_____Learn the numbers/shapes/colors

_____Read stories together

_____Play games together

_____Help their child (children) draw or write

b. Please list other activities that you think would be helpful and enjoyable:

14. How do you think parent/child reading activities would benefit the teen mothers?

_____It would not benefit the mothers.

_____It would raise their self-esteem.

_____It would motivate them to set educational goals for themselves.

_____It would motivate them to accomplish their goals.

_____It would enhance their relationship with their child.

Please list any other ways that this would benefit the teen mother:

15. Based on your observation of the teen moms interaction with their children and/or your group discussions, please answer the following questions:

a. What kinds of things do they enjoy doing with their children?

b. What makes their children smile, laugh, or engage themselves with their mother?

c. What are some of the children's favorite toys?

16. Based on your interviews and group discussion with the teen mothers, please answer the following questions:

a. What are the biggest challenges the young women face as parents?

b. What are the biggest challenges their children face?

c. What are some of the goals that the moms have set for themselves?

17. Are you aware of the programs offered by Youth Service Project's Literacy Program such as reading classes, GED classes, and English classes?

_____ YES _____ NO

a. Are the *mothers* aware of these classes?

_____ YES _____ NO

b. How many moms do you think have participated in the following:

_____ Literacy (reading tutorials)

_____ GED classes

_____ English classes

I APPRECIATE THE TIME YOU HAVE TAKEN TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS. THANK YOU!

Dear TAP Participants:

Hello! Please take a few minutes to complete the attached survey. I work with the YSP Literacy Program. I have been working on a special project for the last few months. It would be helpful if you could share your thoughts on education -- both yours and your children's. In the future, it may be possible to add parent/child reading activities to some of your group meetings.

But first -- I have to know what you are interested in and whether you think this would be worthwhile. With your help, I will be able to answer these questions! ***Thanks for your time and your input!***

Sincerely,

Susan Pinner
Literacy Supervisor

Teens Adapting to Parenting
Educational Interest Survey
for Teens and Their Children

1) a. What is your name?

b. How old are you?

2) a. How many years of school have you completed?

b. Do you have a high school diploma?

c. Are you attending a school or training institute now?

3) Do you need help with any of the following:

_____I need to get my GED

_____I need to learn how to read

_____I need to learn how to spell better

_____I need to improve my math skills

_____I need to improve my writing skills

_____I need to help my children with their homework

_____I need to help my children learn to read

_____I need help finding a training institute, Junior College, or University

_____I need to learn to speak English

Please list any other educational needs that you have:

4) Do you receive public aid?

_____ YES

_____ NO

5) Do you work? _____ YES _____ NO

If so, what do you do?

6) How many children do you have?

Name(s):

Age(s):

Grade(s):

School(s):

7) Are you the only person supporting your child (children)?

_____YES _____NO

If you checked NO, who is helping you tc support your child (children)?

8) Are you married?

9) What does the TAP program consist of? Please check one or all that pertain to this:

_____Counseling session with TAP staff member

_____Attending Literacy, English or GED classes

_____Field trips

_____Volunteering

_____Weekly support groups

_____Activities with your children

Please list any other activities that are a part of the TAP program:

10) How do you feel when you participate in the TAP activities?

_____Comfortable _____Anxious

_____Nervous _____Okay

_____Angry _____Happy

_____Excited _____Encouraged

_____Uncomfortable _____Sad

_____Smarter (like I learned something)

_____I have other feelings (please tell me what they are):

11) Do you bring your children with you to attend group?

_____YES, always _____NO, never _____Yes, sometimes

12) Do you come to group to be with other moms or to be with your children? (or do you have other reasons for coming? Please tell me):

13) Do you think it's important that your child learn something while you are in group?

_____ Yes, it's very important.

_____ No, it's not important.

_____ Yes, it's somewhat important.

_____ I'm not sure if it's important.

14) Do you think it is important to help your child learn and prepare for school?

_____Yes, it's very important.

_____No, it's not important.

_____Yes, it's somewhat important.

_____I'm not sure if it's important.

15) Would you like it if there were parent/child educational activities included in the group meetings?

_____ YES _____ NO

a. What kind of activities would be most helpful or would you enjoy the most?

_____Learn the alphabet

_____Learn numbers/shapes/colors

_____Read stories together

_____Play games together

_____Help your child draw and write

b. List any other ways that you would like to help your child learn:

16) How do you think you would benefit from an activity like this?

_____It would not benefit me.

_____It would make me feel better about myself.

_____It would encourage me to set educational goals for myself.

_____It would motivate me to accomplish my goals.

_____It would enhance my relationship with my child.

Please list any other ways parent/child reading activities would benefit you:

17) How long have you been attending group and/or been a TAP participant?

18) What kind of things do you enjoy doing with your child?

19) What makes your child smile or laugh or engage him/herself with you?

20) What is your child's favorite toy?

21) What is your biggest challenge as a young parent?

22) What are some of the challenges your child (children) face?

23) What are some of the goals you have set for yourself?

24) Are you aware of the programs offered by the YSP Literacy/GED/English program?

_____Yes _____No

a. Have you ever participated in the classes? Which one(s)?

_____Literacy (reading tutoring)

_____GED classes

_____English classes

I APPRECIATE THE TIME YOU HAVE TAKEN TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS. THANK YOU!

APPENDIX 4

CHICAGO CONSORTIUM FOR WORKER EDUCATION
Student Data Sheet

Program:_____Teacher:_____

Name:_____Phone:_____

Address:_____

Date:_____ Place of Work:_____

Class: ____ESL ____GED ____Math ____Other:_____

Why did you want to take this class? Below are some common reasons. Please check the one(s) that apply to you. If none apply, please fill in your reasons next to "other".

____To communicate better at work.

____To communicate better in my community.

____To communicate with my child's teacher or school system.

____To qualify for a promotion at work.

____To qualify for another job. Please name the job:_____

____To get my GED.

____To prepare myself for community college or university.

____To be able to read to my children or grandchildren.

____To be able to help my children with their homework.

____To be able to read the Bible or church newsletter.

____To be able to read the newspaper or community newsletter.

____To feel better about myself by increasing my knowledge about the world or my community.

____Other:_____

_____

Have you taken adult education classes before? ____yes ____no

If yes, where did you take classes? _____

What did you study? _____

How long did you study there? _____

Please describe your job briefly. If you do any reading or writing, such as filling out forms or time sheets, please include that in your description.

CHICAGO CONSORTIUM FOR WORKER EDUCATION
Student Data Sheet (ESL)

Program:_____Teacher:_____

Name:_____Phone:_____

Address:_____

Date:_____ Place of Work:_____

Why do you want to learn English?

_____To speak to my boss or supervisor.

_____To speak to my co-workers.

_____To speak to my neighbors or landlord.

_____To speak to and understand my doctor.

_____To speak to and understand my child's teacher.

_____To understand the radio or television.

_____To read the newspaper.

_____To get another job. What job?_____

_____To get my citizenship.

_____Other:_____

_____

Have you taken ESL classes before? ____yes ____no

If yes, where?_____ For how long?_____

What do you do at work?_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX 5

Tutor Meeting Report

Date:_____ Time:_____

Tutors Attending:_____

Progress Made/Comments:

Group 1:_____

Group 2:_____

Problems Identified:

1 - _____

2 - _____

3 - _____

4 - _____

5 - _____

6 - _____

Solutions Found:

1 - _____

2 - _____

3 - _____

4 - _____

5 - _____

6 - _____

Tutor Meeting Report p. 2

Individual Student Progress

Name of Student	Tutor's Name / Comments / Progress Made
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.
7.	7.
8.	8.
9.	9.
10.	10.
11.	11.
12.	12.
13.	13.

Goal Setting Form

Today's Date:_____ Participant's Name:_____ Counselor's Name:_____

Goal Type/Time Frame	GOAL: Where I want to be	Things that get in my way	Things that help me	Steps I need to take to reach my goal
Mini-Goal: Within one day				
Short-range Goal: Within one month				
Medium-range Goal: 3 months - one year				
Long-Range Goal: 1 year - 5 years				

APPENDIX 6

The Neighborhood Institute

LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1750 East 71st Street
Chicago, Illinois 60649
312·684·4610

Lesson Plan

Date _____

Purpose of Lesson (Objective) _____

_____

Materials _____

_____

_____

Introduction (Motivation) (Preview)

_____

Steps

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

Conclusion

_____

_____

Follow-up (Homework)

_____

Next Lesson

_____

A Ghetto Tech Affiliate

INSTRUCTOR LESSON PLAN

INSTRUCTOR _____

LESSON PLANS FOR THE _____ COURSE. TEXTBOOK _____

START DATE _____ COMPLETION DATE _____

WEEK	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY

ADE FORM 35

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE
Literacay Programs

STUDENT EVALUATION

Name_____ Date_____

Adult Literacy Program Evaluation:

1. How do you feel you have done this quarter?

2. What is your best accomplishment? What can you now do that you were unable to do before this term?

3. What do you still need to work on?

4. Where do you want to be in a year?

5. Have you met your goals and objectives? If not, why not?

6. What can TNI do to better assist you in meeting your goals and objectives?

7. What needs to be improved? Would you like to add or change any classes? hours?

8. What was the best part of the program this year?

9. Would you recommend this program to someone else? Why/Why not?

We would like to know how you feel about certain aspects of this program. Please rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means excellent and 1 means poor.

	POOR				EXCELLENT
Content of the class	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor	1	2	3	4	5
Materials (Books)	1	2	3	4	5
Classroom space	1	2	3	4	5
Overall	1	2	3	4	5

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE
PACT (Family Literacy Program)

EVALUATION

Name_____ Date_____
Child(ren)'s Name(s) & Age(s):_____

1. Which PACT activities did you and your family participate in?

2. Which one did you and the family like best? Why?

3. Which one did you learn the most from?

4. What is something fun or creative that you did with your family after a PACT activity?

5. How do you help your child(ren) to be successful in school?

6. What do you need in order to help them more?

7. What is something about the program that needs to be improved?

8. What is the best thing that has happened in the PACT program for you and your family this year?

9. Would you tell someone about this program? Why? Why not?

10. Have you observed a positive change in your child(ren)'s behavior, grades, attitude, cooperative nature?

We would like to know how you feel about certain aspects of this program. Please rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means excellent and 1 means poor.

	POOR				EXCELLENT
Places visited	1	2	3	4	5
Staff/Volunteers	1	2	3	4	5
Resources/materials	1	2	3	4	5
Children's classroom space	1	2	3	4	5
Overall	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE
LITERACY PROGRAMS
STUDENT AGREEMENT

There are several things that I would like to accomplish in life. I know that in order to obtain my goals and objectives, I must plan and take steps to make these things happen.

My 3 short term goals are:

1. _____

Steps I will take to complete Goal #1 by _____.

2. _____

Steps I will take to complete Goal #2 by _____.

3. _____

Steps I will take to complete Goal #3 by _____.

My 2 long term goals are:

1. _____

Steps I will take to complete this long term goal by _____.

2. _____

Steps I will take to complete this long term goal by _____.

I know my achievements and success will depend on the time, planning and energy that I put forth.

_____ _____

Signature Date

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE LITERACY PROGRAMS
INSTRUCTOR/VOLUNTEER TUTOR
Student Assessment

Please read each item. Place an X under YES or NO for each.

	YES	NO
1. Has there been notable progress with your student this week?	____	____
2. Was this progress noted in:		
Reading	____	____
Math	____	____
Comprehension	____	____
Vocabulary	____	____
Writing skill	____	____
Oral expression	____	____
Other (please list)	____	____
3. Are you aware of student's goals?	____	____
4. Are these realistic (obtainable) goals for this student?	____	____
5. Would you recommend using different -		
Educational materials	____	____
Teaching strategy	____	____
6. Has student mentioned a special problem that may interfere with learning/progressing? If yes, please explain.	____	____
7. Has student mentioned personal gains/ accomplishments? If yes, please explain.	____	____
8. Have you observed any notable change in student's behavior this week? Or do you wish to share notable antedotes that may have occurred?	____	____

APPENDIX 7

FIRMAN COMMUNITY SERVICES

CHECKLIST FOR PORTFOLIO CONTENT

YES NO

1. **INTAKE**

   * Biographical information
   * SORT (initial)
   * SORT (subsequent)
   * READ Assessment
   * 5 educationally important questions

   Comments:

2. **ANECDOTAL RECORDS**

   * daily activities -

     Comments:

   * student comments, quotes, etc -

     Comments:

   * tutor observations -

     Comments:

YES NO

3. **BOOK LIST**

* Title
* Author
* # of pages
* Readability

Comments:

4. **WRITING SAMPLES**

* mechanics - writing on line, forming letters, space, etc.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

* length of sample

Comments:

* content - reflections, reactions, or revelations vs. repetition of story

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Scale 1=poor; 5=excellent

* purpose of writing-internal vs. external

Comments:

YES NO

5. **MATHEMATICS SAMPLES**

* addition
* subtraction
* multiplication
* division
* fractions
* decimals
* advanced

Comments:

6. **GOALS**

* Are any present?
* Short/long?
* Real/Imaginary?
* Internal vs. external?
  (self vs. Project Chance)
* Measurement/achievement tools

Comments:

APPENDIX 8

Working Knowledge Educational Program - Midwest Women's Center

Participant - Staff Contract

As a participant in the Working Knowledge Educational Program, I:

I. Understand the following rules regarding attendance:

1. No more than three absences are permitted per month.

2. If, due to an emergency, I must be absent, I must:

   A. Call and leave a message for the program counselor, Wanda Fultz, prior to 9 a.m. and

   B. Bring a written statement from my doctor or a written explanation of my absence the next day of class.

3. If I am absent more than three days per month, my case will be reviewed by the program counselor and coordinator and my eligibility to remain in the program will be determined.

II. Agree to follow the above rules.

III. Agree to commit the necessary time, energy, and motivation to improve my basic skills and reach my educational goals, including:

1. Attending class at least 16 hours per week;

2. Carrying out assigned homework, and

3. Studying on my own time and/or with after-class tutors to make up classes which I have missed.

_____ _____

Name - Printed Date

_____ _____

Signature Phone

As staff of the Working Knowledge Educational Program, we agree to:

1. Provide quality educational programs;

2. Provide supportive services and referrals, and

C-2 3. Meet with students by appointment to discuss individual needs and educational concerns, and address those to the best of the our ability with available program resources.

Julie Kruse Program Coordinator	Date
Wanda Fultz Counselor	Date